

**REMARKS**

Replacement drawings are attached to overcome the objections listed on PTO 948.

Claims 16-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuo (US Patent No. 6,767,024). Examiner mischaracterizes the structure and function of Kuo, giving it adjustment capabilities that it does not have, nor can have, without re-engineering. Examiner describes an adjustment range of Kuo corresponding to approximately 90 degrees between reference character 11 and stop device 13 in FIG. 4, when in fact, Kuo can only be positioned at the end points, at reference character 11 or at stop device 13, and not at any point therebetween. Indeed, lever 22 is either held in the locked position (spring 231 wedged against stop device 13), or upon release of the spring 231, the lever 22 is automatically rotated back to its operative position (near reference character 11) by the tensioned control cable B, in turn biased by the torsion spring 612 connected to the cap 61. Accordingly, the lever 22 cannot be *positioned* within a range of alternative second suspension settings precisely because Kuo is entirely missing an “adjustment assembly configured to position the actuator assembly relative to the body in the second position” as claimed in the present invention. Kuo only permits lever 22 to be *positioned* in a single locked position or alternatively a single operative position. For this reason, the 102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 17-21 and 23 were rejected as claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Since claims 17-21 and 23 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of claim 16, they are felt to overcome the 102 rejection in the same manner as claim 16.

Claims 1, 2, 11-15 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo in view of Girvin (US Patent No. 6,382,370). For the reasons stated above, Kuo fails to disclose an adjustment assembly as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Kuo and Girvin fails to disclose an adjustment assembly as recited in claim 1. For this reason, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Serial No. 10/707,019

Claims 2, 11-15 and 26 were rejected as claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since claims 2, 11-15 and 26 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of claim 1, they are felt to overcome the 103 rejection in the same manner as claim 1.

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the Examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNT et al.



---

Lisa Serdynski, Attorney  
Registration No. 40,307  
SRAM Corporation  
1333 N. Kingsbury, 4th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60642  
(312) 664-3652